

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 5, 6, 8, 12, 23, and 25-28 are amended. No claims are canceled or added. Thus, claims 2-8, 10-13, 15-18 and 22-33 remain pending in the application.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 112, Indefinite

Claims 2-8, 10-13, 15-18, and 22-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 5

Specifically the limitations "a growth program", "an optimized hard disk drive", "a basic program", and "self-optimization" are cited as being indefinite.

With regards to "a growth program", claim 5 has been amended to recite:

wherein the growth program contains instructions for performing at least one process of a writing process of writing servo information onto a disk of the hard disk drive, a pretest process that optimizes parameters of servo systems and/or channel systems of the hard disk drive, and a verification test process that verifies whether the optimized parameters provide design values for operation of the hard disk drive.

Applicants submit that an artisan in the art can determine the metes and bounds of these three processes as servo information, optimization of parameters of servo systems and/or channel systems, and verifying design values of the hard drive are all definite.

With regards to "an optimized hard disk drive," the limitation "*on which the growth program has at least been partially executed*" has been added to clarify what an optimized hard disk drive is. As long as the term "growth program" is definite, then so is this limitation.

With regards to the term "a basic program," the term "program" is definite and the term "basic" is an identifier that distinguishes the basic program from the growth program. Thus, the term "a basic program" is definite.

With regards to the term "self-optimization," this term no longer appears in the claim.

Claim 12

With regards to the term "optimization processing", the limitation "*wherein the optimization processing includes optimizing parameters of servo systems and/or channel systems of the first hard drive*" has been added. As to the requirement of a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree of optimization, Applicants submit that no degree is required since any criteria or degree may be used to determine when an optimization of the parameters would end.

Claim 23

With regards to the term "optimization/inspection process" and the term "a growth program," Applicants submit that amendments as described above provide definiteness.

Claim 25

With regards to the term "inspection process," the limitation "*wherein the inspection process involves reading out the servo information written to the disk of the hard disk*" has been added.

Claim 26

With regards to the term "optimization/inspection process" and the term "a growth program," Applicants submit that amendments as described above provide definiteness.

Claim 27

With regards to the term "optimization/inspection process" and the term "a growth program," Applicants submit that amendments as described above provide definiteness.

Claim 28

With regards to the term "a finished hard disk drive," claim 28 recites "*requesting means for sending a request command for the first program from a finished hard disk drive where servo information has been written to at least one disk of the finished hard disk drive.*" Applicants submit that the term "finished hard disk drive" is definite.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants note with appreciation the indication that claims 2-8, 10-13, 15-18, and 22-33 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action. Applicants submit that these claims are now allowable given the amendments and arguments made above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at (415) 576-0200.

Respectfully submitted,

/David B. Raczkowski/

David B. Raczkowski
Reg. No. 52,145

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
DBR/scz
61199088 v1